

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the amendments set forth above and the below remarks in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claims 4 and 20 are amended herein and dependent claims 21-23 are added.

Claim 4 is amended to correct a typographical error.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, and 17-20 as being anticipated by Stone et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,737, hereinafter "Stone") and of claims 7 and 12-16 as being obvious over Stone in view of Nine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,611, hereinafter "Nine").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as to independent claims 1 and 19 and maintain that Stone neither describes nor suggests the method of claim 1 comprising "storing the information about the corresponding resources in a database" or the computer program product of claim 19 comprising instructions causing a computer to "store the information about the corresponding resources in a database." Claim 20 has been amended to recite "wherein the software includes... a resource-independent device configured to use the executable modules to monitor changes in configuration and attributes information associated with the corresponding managed devices and to store the configuration and attributes information associated with the corresponding managed devices from the executable modules in a database." It is submitted the Stone neither describes nor suggests the system of amended claim 20.

As pointed out in Applicant's Response dated March 14, 2005, the Stone monitor notification library contains routines that, when executed, result in a notification being forwarded to the notification handler (col. 6, lines 14-22). Applicants maintain that the Stone monitor

notification library is not a database storing information about the corresponding resources, as claimed.

In response to Applicant's arguments in the March 14, 2005 Amendment, the Examiner states "...it is maintained that the monitor notification library also stores information about the corresponding resources being monitored. For the sake of clarity, the applicant is further directed to column 7, lines 18-43 which discusses in more detail the notification entries present in the notification library. It is noted that 'the notification entry includes the monitor request information, the current value of the resource to be monitored and some historical information about the resource.'"

Applicants respectfully point out that, according to claims 1, 19, and 20, the information about the corresponding resources or managed devices that is stored in a database is the information that is returned by the executable modules. While the Stone notification entries include "the current value of the resource to be monitored and some historical information about the resource," there is no teaching or suggestion in Stone that this information is returned by the executable modules. Also, there is no teaching or suggestion that the Stone notification entry is present in the notification library 17. As stated at col. 7, lines 18-21, "...the resource monitor module builds a notification entry. The notification entry is a structure for storing a request from monitor registrar 18 for a resource to be monitored." In fact, although Stone is silent as to the location of the notification entry, one might conclude from the fact that the notification entry is built by the resource monitor module, that the notification entry is located in the resource monitor module.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 19 and 20 are patentable over Stone.

Claims 2-6, 8-11, and 17-18 depend from, and thus include the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 2-6, 8-11 and 17-18 are patentable, at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1.

Claims 7 and 12-16 are rejected as being obvious over Stone in view of Nine. Claims 7 and 12-16 are dependent on claim 1 and thus, include the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claims 7 and 12-16 are patentable over Stone in view of Nine, at least for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1.

Applicants have added new claims 21-23 which are dependent on claims 1, 19, and 20, respectively, and which describe the information about the corresponding resources or managed devices that is stored in a database. Support for new claims 21-23 is found on pages 4, 10, and 11 of the specification, for example. Examination of claims 21-23 is respectfully requested.

As the claims and the entire case are believed to be in condition for allowance, an indication thereof is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that this amendment places the application in condition for allowance or better form for appeal by restricting the issues on appeal, and thus, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.116.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to telephone the undersigning attorney if there are any questions regarding this Amendment or this application.


Applicants do not acquiesce to any assertion made by the Examiner that is not specifically addressed herein.

The Assistant Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 500845.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12 Sept. 2005

DALY, CROWLEY, MOFFORD & DURKEE, LLP

By: 
Judith C. Crowley
Reg. No. 35,091
Attorney for Applicant(s)
354A Turnpike Street - Suite 301A
Canton, MA 02021-2714
Tel.: (781) 401-9988, Ext. 12
Fax: (781) 401-9966
jcc@dc-m.com